

Speech

delivered by

Hon. Charles Murphy, M.P.

in the

House of Commons

on

February 26th, 1913

in opposition to

The Second Reading of the
Borden Naval Bill

10400

107

10

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): In rising to address the House upon the important subject which continues to engage its attention, I do so with a feeling of thankfulness to the Government for having introduced a measure which, more than any other single piece of legislation in recent years has served to rouse in the people of this country the slumbering spirit of Canadian nationality. I need not be told that that was not the intention of the Government in introducing this Bill, but precisely for that reason the result that I have mentioned is all the more grateful to me and to my fellow Liberals, who share with me the conviction that Canada's strength to Great Britain in time of need is to be measured, not by noisy protestations of loyalty; not by those muddled declamations about 'one flag, one fleet, one throne,' so frequently heard in the moist and mellow hours of so many dinners and banquets; not by free gifts or temporary loans of ships or money—not by any of these, but rather that Canada's strength to Great Britain in time of need is to be measured by Canada's unimpeded growth in all the attributes of self-government as an autonomous nation within the British Empire. As an old and observant member of this House, you, Sir, are aware that, thanks to successive jingo campaigns carried on by hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends, it had ceased to be popular for an hon. gentleman of this House to describe himself as a Canadian. That state of affairs continued down to the very hour in which the right hon. the Minister introduced his naval proposals in this House on the 5th of December last. From that hour, Sir, a change set in. Opposition to the Government's proposals caused people to think for themselves, and I venture to say that within the past two months there has been a greater change in public opinion in Canada than ever before took place in this country with regard to any public question, within the same period of time. For one proof of that, let me refer you to the fact that one hon. gentleman after another has addressed himself to the consideration of these proposals simply as a Canadian, and such an avowal on his part has excited none of the surprise, none of the dissent, which it would have excited if made only a few months ago. The change to which I am alluding is at times unconsciously reflected by hon. gentlemen opposite, not so much by their words as by their actions in this House. You remember, Sir, with what acclamation they greeted the ponderous and somewhat theatric statement of their leader on the 5th of December last, that the clouds were heavy; that we could hear the booming of the distant thunder and see the lightning flashes above the horizon; and that when these same words were quoted on Friday night last by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), they were greeted with derisive laughter by the very hon. gentlemen who less than three months ago had so loudly acclaimed them. Statesmanlike words on the 5th of December—inflated rhetoric at the end of February. I need not multiply proofs of the changed and improved state of public opinion to which I

have referred, but I trust that I have given sufficient evidence of the fact to encourage hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to persist in their opposition to this measure until the right hon. Prime Minister is forced to keep at least one of his pledges, and submit this proposal to the people.

From your knowledge, Mr. Speaker, of Canadian history, you are aware that when the people of what was formerly known as Upper Canada were called upon to decide the vital question of whether or not they should be governed by Downing Street, through a governor or by a ministry responsible to them and to them only, the chief of one of the Iroquois tribes issued a proclamation, in which he said:

The real issue is, whether the country is to remain under the direction and government of the Queen, or become one of the United States.

Now, Sir, it seems to me that a reincarnation of that Iroquois chief must have inspired the present naval policy of this Government, and at the same time suggested the stock Tory argument that a Canadian Naval policy tends to separation from Great Britain. In any event we have in the Bill now before this House the first proposal ever made by any political party in this country since responsible government was introduced that we should deliberately abandon a principle for which Canadians of a past generation fought and yielded up their lives, and by such abandonment put Canada back in the position of colonial dependence and colonial inferiority which marked her status in the days of the Family Compact. And why, Sir, are we asked to commit this act of national abasement? Simply to enable this coalition Government to pay the price of the alliance between the demon of jingoism and the demon of nationalism, and thus continue in power for a few months longer.

Now, Sir, there is a phase of this matter to which, in my judgment, too little attention has been paid in this discussion. In my opinion, it is not proper to advance this Bill another stage until we have had ministerial explanations as to the relations that existed between the right hon. the Prime Minister and his late colleague the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), upon this important question. It is true that the House has in its possession the letter of resignation written by the late Minister of Public Works to the right hon. the Prime Minister, but that letter, may I point out to you Mr. Speaker, deals only with what happened when the member for Jacques Cartier went out of the Cabinet. The matter of real interest to Parliament and the country, a matter that should be put within the knowledge of Parliament and the country, is what happened when he went in to the Cabinet. We naturally ask ourselves, were he and his leader then in accord upon this naval question? We assume that they were. If this is correct, then, Sir, the right hon. the Prime Minister must have changed since then. He has not offered the House or the country any explanation on that score, and I assume he will not do so. But the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) could give us an explanation, and

no doubt he would do so if his state of health permitted him to return to parliament. Such an explanation is, I submit, Mr. Speaker, absolutely necessary before we can have that knowledge of the whole situation, without which it is impossible to properly discuss the proposals of the Government, and without which we should not be asked to discuss those proposals. Now, in the absence of that explanation, the only way in which we can arrive at some knowledge of the relations that have existed between the right hon. the Prime Minister and his late colleague, and between the two wings of their supporters, is by referring to the records in which these relations are disclosed, and that I propose to do as briefly as possible.

The first occasion on which the right hon. the Prime Minister publicly identified himself with the naval policy of the member for Jacques Cartier was when in November, 1910, during the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, he voted for the amendment introduced by the member for Jacques Cartier. That amendment has already been read to the House, but in view of its importance, I crave the privilege of reading it again. It was in these terms:

The House regrets that the Speech from the Throne gives no indication whatever of the intention of the Government to consult the people on its naval policy and the general question of the contribution of Canada to Imperial armaments.

So far as we in the House know, and so far as the public outside know, the vote that the present Prime Minister gave in support of that amendment marked the first time that he had publicly signified his adherence to the policy of the leader of the Nationalists within Parliament, a policy which declared that no action should be taken, either with regard to a contribution, or with regard to a permanent naval policy, until the people were consulted. That marked the beginning, as I have said, of the alliance between the Prime Minister and the member for Jacques Cartier on this subject. Now, the alliance, of which that vote was the evidence, that took place within the walls of Parliament, was duplicated by another alliance in the country between the Nationalist and Conservative wings of the party supporting the present Prime Minister. The alliance continued to grow closer and closer, and eventually, when the general elections were brought on, it was found that the Conservative candidates in the province of Quebec who sought to get the Nationalist vote in their respective constituencies were obliged to sign a pledge which became known as the Nationalist pledge in that campaign. That pledge, for instance, formed part of the election addresses issued by the Conservative candidate in the county of Shefford, in the province of Quebec, Mr. James Davidson. As set out in his election address, it read as follows:

I declare that if I am elected on the 21st of September next, I shall work and vote against any prime minister of whatever party he may be who shall continue the actual policy of the navy as voted in 1910, without

having previously given to the Canadian people the occasion of pronouncing themselves upon this question by way of plebiscite or special referendum.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend says hear, hear. I am glad that there is at least one hon. member on the Government side of the House, who adheres to the pledge, from which his leader has ever since run away. Now, this pledge, as contained in the election address of Mr. Davidson, in the county of Shefford, was similar in terms to a like pledge signed by Dr. Pickell, the Conservative candidate in the county of Missisquoi, and which formed part of that gentleman's election address. An important incident connected with these Nationalist pledges is that the Prime Minister, then leader of the Opposition, set the seal of his approval on them by appearing on the same platforms with Mr. Davidson and Dr. Pickell, and speaking in their support at Granby and Bedford, in the counties of Shefford and Missisquoi on August 30th, 1911. Thus, Mr. Speaker, the then leader of the Opposition, now the right hon. Prime Minister, publicly committed himself to the policy of consulting the people before doing anything, either by way of contribution, or by way of adopting a permanent policy with regard to the navy. I have no fault to find with the right hon. gentleman for adhering to that position because, in going upon these platforms in the province of Quebec and in speaking in support of candidates who had taken these Nationalist pledges, he was acting strictly in accordance with the vote which he gave in this House for the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier in November 1910. While this was going on in Quebec what was taking place in Ontario? In the province of Ontario, Conservative candidates who had Nationalist voters in their constituencies were signing pledges similar to those signed by the Nationalist or Conservative candidates in Quebec. In proof of that, Mr. Speaker, let me refer you to two places such as I have described that were published in *Le Devoir* newspaper on September 11, 1911. These pledges are signed by Mr. George Gordon, former member for the district of Nipissing and since appointed to the Senate, and by the then Conservative candidate in the constituency of East Algoma, now the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smyth) who represents that riding in this House. The first of these pledges, as published in *Le Devoir* on September 11, 1911, runs in the following words:

Mattawa, Ontario, September 11, 1911.

Charles McCrea, Sudbury.

Dear Sir:—I certainly am opposed to reciprocity pact and the naval policy of the Government, and will support a request for repeal of naval policy and referendum to the people, no matter who is premier.

(Sgd.) Geo. Gordon.

The second pledge was in these words:

Providence Bay, Ontario,
September 8, 1911.

Charles McCrea, Sudbury.

Dear Sir:—I am opposed to reciprocity pact. I am opposed to naval policy of the Liberal Government. I will support request for repeal of same and referendum to the people on naval question, no matter who is premier.

(Sgd.) W. R. Smyth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before proceeding further, it is important to note that these two pledges, although dated from places more than two hundred miles apart, bear the same date, and they are addressed to the same person, Mr. Charles McCrea, of Sudbury. It was publicly stated, and not successfully denied, that both of these pledges were inspired by Mr. Henri Bourassa, leader of the Nationalist party. Moreover, the House should bear in mind that the gentleman to whom, strangely enough, they are both addressed is a leading Sudbury Conservative; in fact, he was at the time, if I am correctly informed, secretary of the Conservative association in the district of Nipissing. He was also the chairman of the Board of Provincial License Commissioners, a very intimate friend of the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), who now represents that district in this House, and, in addition, was the provincial Conservative candidate and was afterwards elected to the legislature of Ontario.

In printing these pledges *Le Devoir* used this significant language:

We submit to-day to the readers of *Le Devoir* and to the public of the province of Quebec two documents which should serve to open the eyes of a certain number of good men duped by the speakers and journals of the ministry. How many times have they not declared that it would be impossible to obtain the repeal of the naval law, because the English provinces would oppose repeal en bloc. Very well. Here are two Ontario English-speaking candidates following the like course of Mr. Davidson and Pickel in our province, who pronounce against the naval law and for an appeal to the people, no matter who may be Prime Minister.

Significant as were these pledges, there was another event which happened about the same time, of greater significance still. At Sudbury, on September 18, 1911, a large public meeting was held at which Mr. Bourassa, editor of *Le Devoir*, was the principal speaker. Not to burden the House with too many extracts, I will just read a few sentences from the report of that meeting published in the *Toronto Globe* of September 19, 1911. They are as follows:

(Spec' Despatch to the Globe.)

Sudbury, September 18.—The Conservative party has crossed the stubicon. The alliance of Borden and Bourassa has developed from that of common interest into that of proclaimed contract. No bones were made about it. From the moment of the arrival of the Nationalist leader this morning, when President R. R. McKessock, K.C., of the Sudbury Conservative Association, called for 'three cheers for Bourassa and Borden,' placing the potent partner in the premier position, to the final acclaim for our two leaders, with which the call for cheers for Sir Wilfrid Laurier was countered at the close of the great meeting, the definite character of the union was emphasized.

The Nationalist leader was accorded an elaborate welcome. He was accompanied by Messrs. Henri Morel, Conservative M.P.P. for East Nipissing, and A. A. Aubin, Conservative M.P.P. for West Nipissing. He was met at the depot by the federal candidate, Mr. Gordon, and by President McKessock and the executive association, and escorted to the home of Mr. W. J. Bell, a friend and supporter of Hon. Frank Cochrane, for luncheon.

Mr. Irwin Hilliard, K.C., of Morrisburg, opened the meeting by claiming to represent Sir James Whitney, in declaring that 'the English-speaking Tories of Ontario are going to resent at the polls *The Globe's* slander of Mr. Bourassa.'

Mr. George Gordon, the Conservative candidate, told the people: 'I welcome Mr. Bourassa from the bottom of my heart. He and I are hand-in-hand in opposition to Laurier's silly naval policy. I give him, as your representative, the keys to the whole north Ontario district.'

Finally Mr. Bourassa himself assured the people that the Opposition had remodelled its naval policy in accordance with the position of Mr. Monk, with an appeal to the electors, and accordingly he was lending his aid to their cause.

By way of parenthesis, let me add, that the reference that Mr. Bourassa made in that speech to the remodelling of his policy by the then leader of the Opposition was due to the fact that the day before this meeting the then leader of the Opposition, now the right hon. the leader of the Government, issued his second election manifesto, and in that manifesto he took a new position on the navy, a position which the *Montreal Star*, the chief of his present hysterical brigade, described as magnificent on the negative side, but which Mr. Bourassa described as being so entirely in accordance with the policy of Mr. Monk with an appeal to the electors that he was supporting it. All the pledges as to consulting the people that were given before the election were repeated after the election. They were repeated with special emphasis in the counties of Jacques Cartier and Quebec when the late hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) and the present hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) sought election in these constituencies. The statements that were made on these occasions have been presented to the House over and over again and I need not repeat them to-day. I will however ask you to bear further in mind that, although the subject of the navy was referred to many times last session, no intimation was ever given to this House or to the country, that the Prime Minister and his then colleague, the then Minister of Public Works, were not still at one upon the question of consulting the people before deciding either upon a contribution or a permanent naval policy.

That state of affairs continued up to the month of October last when the then Minister of Public Works resigned. In resigning, he gave to the public a statement that the reason for his resignation was that the Government had decided to give a contribution and that as he was pledged to consult the people before such a step was taken, he felt in honour bound to resign his portfolio. The letter of resignation written by Mr. Monk contained such an important contradiction of the statements made to this House by the Prime Minister on the 5th of

December last when introducing his naval proposals that it makes the necessity for ministerial explanations absolutely imperative. You will recall, Sir, that in his speech of the 5th of December, the Prime Minister read as part of that speech the memorandum from the Admiralty, and he stated that the Government had reached the decision to give this \$35,000,000 contribution after they had considered the facts set forth in that memorandum. In other words, that the receipt and consideration of this memorandum were the determining factors with the Government in arriving at their decision. What are the facts? The letter of resignation written by Mr. Monk proves conclusively that the Government reached a decision to give this \$35,000,000 contribution more than two weeks before they could possibly have had that memorandum in their hands. Let me adduce the proof of that. The letter of the Secretary of State for the Colonies transmitting this memorandum is dated Downing Street, 25th October, 1912. Allowing eight or nine days for this document to reach Ottawa, it could not have been here before the 2nd or 3rd of November at the earliest. Now, the letter of resignation sent by the late Minister of Public Works to his leader is dated October 18, 1912, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read the first sentence in that letter:

My Dear Premier:—I regret to find that I cannot concur in the decision arrived at by the Cabinet yesterday,

You will note that the 'yesterday' referred to in the letter was October 17.

to place on behalf of Canada an emergency contribution of \$35,000,000 at the disposal of the British Government for naval purposes with the sanction of Parliament but without giving the Canadian people an opportunity of expressing their approval of this important step before it is taken.

There you have conclusive proof that while this memorandum could not possibly have been in the hands of the Government until November the 2nd or 3rd at the earliest, Mr. Monk in his letter of resignation states that the decision to give \$35,000,000 was reached October 17, 1912, at least two weeks before the Government had the document upon which their whole case is founded. Now, Sir, what hon. gentlemen, in the face of these facts, would stand up in this House and seriously ask us to take the word of the Prime Minister upon this or any other subject? I submit, Sir, that the case against the Government in this regard is absolutely unanswerable; I submit that unless the Prime Minister is to be branded in a way which the rules of the House will not permit me to designate, he should defer the further consideration of this measure until his late colleague the Minister of Public Works is in his place in this House to give us the opportunity of hearing from him the real reason of his resignation from the Cabinet.

The situation which is disclosed by these conflicting statements between the late Minister of Public Works and the Prime Minister gives colour to the statements published in *Le Devoir*

and repeated in this House by several hon. gentlemen; and as to the statement that the Prime Minister got three memoranda from the Admiralty before he found one to suit his purpose. These conflicting statements between the Prime Minister and the late Minister of Public Works lend special point to what was said by the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mondou) a couple of weeks ago in his speech in this House when he said: The Prime Minister was in favour of a contribution before he went to England; he went to England, he saw the Admiralty, and came back and was still in favour of a contribution. And from that the hon. member deduced the very natural conclusion that the Admiralty would give any representative of Canada just about what he wanted. But the important point is that the hon. member for Yamaska made the statement that the Prime Minister had decided to give the contribution before he left for England, and the Prime Minister was in his seat in the House when he heard the hon. gentleman make that statement, and the Prime Minister spoke in the House that same evening and he never challenged one word that had been uttered by the hon. member for Yamaska. Surely good faith requires that we shall receive explanations both from the Prime Minister and from his late colleague before we are asked to advance this Bill to another stage.

I desire to review some of the arguments tendered by our hon. friends opposite in support of a contribution and against a Canadian naval policy. In the first place, I wish to refer to some of the arguments advanced by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine who, I am sorry to see is not in his place. You will remember that in order to prove that the naval policy of the late Government was an ineffective one, and in order to show that the ships which were to compose that navy would be obsolete before they were half constructed, the Minister of Marine read a statement purporting to have been written by Commander Roper and dated September 20, 1911, the day before the general election. The Minister was careful to draw the attention of the House to the fact that it was dated the 20th of September, 1911, and he did so with a gleam of pleasure in his eye and a note of exultation in his voice. I say that it is a suspicious document and for two reasons. In the first place, the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) was then the Minister in charge of the department and he remained in charge of that department from September 20 to October 6, or more than two weeks after the date on which that statement purports to have been written, and I have his assurance that he never saw or heard of that document until the present Minister of Marine rose in his place in this House and read it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It was all concocted afterwards.

Mr. MURPHY: It is inconceivable that an officer with a proper sense of his duty such as I must assume Commander Roper had, would have kept from his minister during these two weeks knowledge of that document

when he knew that his minister was engaged during these two weeks in daily consultation with his colleagues in regard to the tenders that had been submitted for the construction of ships for the navy and the awarding of the contracts for these ships. It is inconceivable, I repeat, that an officer with a proper sense of his duty, such as we must assume that Commander Roper had, would have concealed from his minister all knowledge of such a document. The document however, is suspicious for a much stronger reason than that. It is a suspicious document for the reason that, within twelve months prior to the date upon which it purports to have been written, Commander Roper in a public address gave utterance to opinions and sentiments diametrically opposed to those contained in the statement which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries read to this House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He was defended on the floor of the House by his minister then.

Mr. MURPHY: As my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may not have heard about this speech, I propose to place some pertinent paragraphs from it upon 'Hansard.' In doing so, I will not transgress, for the present at least, the rule which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries laid down in his speech with regard to quotations. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries deprecated any person going further back than the year 1910; he said that anything before that was ancient history. Apparently the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, knows that his colleagues in this Government, like some frail favourites of the stage, have a past on this question; but, unlike these theatrical people, he does not seem to think that it would be good business to advertise the fact; so he puts an embargo on going further back than the year 1910. For the present at all events, I will meet his wishes on that point. This speech was delivered by Commander Roper at a directors' luncheon of the Canada Central Exhibition Association, held on Tuesday, September 13, 1910. As reported in the Ottawa Citizen of Wednesday, September 14, 1910, it contained the following paragraphs:

Since landing in this great country some four months back, an expression has often been used in connection with the Canadian navy, not only in conversation with me, but also in the press, which, to say the least of it, is hardly as desirable as it might be. I allude to the term 'Tin Pot.'

I am sorry that my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett), is not here to listen to what Commander Roper had to say about himself and other members of his party who used that term.

Mr. BELAND: He is recuperating.

Mr. MURPHY: Probably. Commander Roper continues:

'Tinpot navy' is often, much too often, used; and I have been to some trouble to find out the origin of the term, and I have come to the conclusion that it is used by some of those people who are in disagreement with the present programme regarding the navy, and I firmly

believe that "this disagreement arises" chiefly through ignorance or want of thought.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is the true Roper.

Mr. MURPHY: I will repeat those words:

Through ignorance or want of thought. To a large number of people, the beginning and end of a navy is to be reckoned in dreadnoughts, and also as regards obtaining a fleet, all that has to be done is to say: 'We'll have a navy' and they expect to find a fleet of dreadnoughts floating on the St. Lawrence next day. That, of course, is a slight exaggeration, but it is the principle on which they work.

With regard to Canada's share in Imperial defence, a large faction only find one aim in view, namely, the presentation of a couple of dreadnoughts to the Mother Country. There arise other ideas, but whatever they were, a dreadnought was invariably included, and so when these people found that the Government proposal did not include a dreadnought, they immediately designated it 'Tin Pot' which, I think you will agree with me, is rather a contemptuous term to apply to a service which I sincerely trust and hope will, in the near future, be looked upon with gratification and pride by every soul who has the honour of calling himself or herself a Canadian citizen, and who is consequently a member of this great Empire of ours, the greatest the world has ever seen.

To show you how much some of these people understand about what they are talking—a gentleman came up to me the other day and said: 'What I cannot make out is, what Canada wants half a dozen river destroyers for, when the St. Lawrence is the only river they can possibly be required to work on.'

Is it not too bad that the hon. member for Calgary is not in his place to finish the rest of this paragraph?

I then had to explain to him that these river destroyers are ocean-going destroyers of the very latest type, but are technically known as the river class, as they are named after various rivers in Great Britain to distinguish them from other classes. That, I think, is a very good illustration of the amount of knowledge possessed by some of these people, and I would advise them to go and study Brassey and other standard books, before venturing to talk or write on that which they know so little about.

I would say the same about some of my hon. friends on the opposite side.

Now, a fleet is composed of various classes of ships, namely, battleships, cruisers, torpedo craft, fleet auxiliaries. I have no time to-day to fully explain the working of these classes of vessels in connection with one another. Briefly let me say that battleships are the vessels which should bear the brunt of the fighting, and it is an admiral's duty to so place his battleships that they will in due course meet those of the enemy. Now, he cannot do this without information, and it is the cruisers' duty to obtain and transmit this intelligence. In other words, battleships without cruisers are like blind men without a guide. During my service in the navy, it has been my lot to take part in six of the annual manoeuvres while I was serving one the staff of the admiral in command of one side. From beginning to end, it was always one cry 'information.'

The admiral can never be too well informed. Study the life of the greatest of all naval leaders, Nelson, and you will find there that his one cry the whole time was for cruisers. Why? Because he wanted means of obtaining information. Now, I have no hesitation in saying that, at the present moment, Britain has plenty of dreadnoughts. But has she plenty of cruisers? For an expression of opinion I refer you to that distinguished sailor, Admiral Lord Charles Berkeford, who emphatically

cally says she has not. When, therefore, the question arises as to what share Canada is to take in Imperial defence, every detail and item must be considered. It is not that Britain requires actual assistance from Canada, so much as she requires that, in the event of trouble, Canada will to a certain extent be able to look after herself. The present naval programme, namely, four cruisers and six destroyers, is framed to meet the existing situation, keeping in view the amount of money available to the Government. These cruisers and destroyers will also be a useful addition to the Imperial navy in the case of necessity. Dreadnoughts cost a lot of money, they also take a large number of men to man them, and docks of the largest capacity to hold them. If, therefore, a policy including dreadnoughts were embarked on, a very large sum of money would be involved, and probably considerably more than Canada can at present afford.

Mr. Speaker, I invite your particular attention to this:

If I were asked as to the relative importance of the various items composing a navy I should place them as follows: Men, ships, docks. Personally I do not believe that we take sufficient count of the personnel. The wear and tear of a future naval war on a human being will be terrific, and in my humble opinion, cases will arise where the personnel will be beaten while the material is still available.

If the future struggle arises before the Canadian vessels are ready, the men can always be placed at the disposal of the Mother Country. There are many distinguished and clever men who say that the next trouble will arise in 1912. On that point I express no opinion; but what I do say is that apart from building ships, Canada, by training and supplying men to the Mother Country, will be rendering her the greatest assistance possible. Between now and 1912 there is no time to build dreadnoughts or other ships, but there is time to enlist and partially train men. Wiping 1912 out of consideration, everything must have a beginning. Rome was not built in a day and neither was the Imperial navy. This is the commencement of the Canadian navy, and it is bound to take time to spring into being. What the future may have in store nobody can tell, and what this beginning may ultimately lead to it is impossible to guess. Now, I hold no brief for the Canadian Government; I am talking as a naval officer. The Government's policy as regards the navy may be right, it may be wrong, but this I do say, and say with all the earnestness I can command: This policy has been framed by the representatives of the people and is now law. Criticise the programme by all means; but do not let that criticism take the form of placing obstacles in the navy and also dragging the navy into party politics. Apart from anything else, the navy should be separated from and above party politics. The Canadian navy is a branch of the service of the Empire and as such it is the duty of all Canadians and the whole of Canada to assist by their utmost endeavour in making it a great success and an efficient service.

He concluded with these words:

I again repeat that it is the duty of every one of us to assist in the making of this branch of the navy, no matter how big or how small it may be, a thoroughly efficient force, so that it may be ready at any time to take its place with the remainder of the naval forces for the defence of the Empire.

That was Commander Roper's opinion in 1910. Without amplifying what I have said about the suspicious character of the statement read to the House, dated September 20, 1911, I may point to the fact that in the speech, extracts

from which I have just read, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is refuted out of the mouth of his own officers, and he and his fellow members are condemned for the tactics they have pursued with regard to a Canadian naval policy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend allow me to add that after September 21, 1911, I had occasion to meet Admiral Kingsmill, who was in charge of the Canadian Naval Department, and he expressed the utmost regret that the Laurier naval policy would not be carried out.

Mr. MURPHY: In placing men as the first requirement of a navy, Commander Roper not only had the authority of Lord Charles Beresford to support him, but also the authority of the Right Hon. Winston Churchill, the present First Lord of the Admiralty. In a letter addressed to his constituents, Winston Churchill said:

Four cardinal errors, each more stupid and vicious than the other, require exposure. The first is the attempt to measure the strength of the British navy, or any other navy, in dreadnoughts alone. Men, guns and ships are all necessary to a navy, none can be dispensed with. But of these the first, most decisive, most capacious factor is men. All calculations in machines apart from men are vain. It is to the officers and men of the British navy, to their virtue and seamanship, that the safety of this Empire must primarily be confided.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries also told the House that recruiting was not popular, and that even if we had the ships we could not get the men to man them. Once more let me appeal to the records and show this House and this country how little the Minister of Marine knows about the documents contained in the archives of his own department. In the report of the Department for the Naval Service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911—that is covering the period when the late Government was in power and had charge of the Canadian Naval Service—he will find on page 8 that Admiral Kingsmill, after speaking of the purchase of the ships Niobe and Rainbow says:

On the arrival of the ships at Halifax and Esquimaux, respectively, recruiting was started. By arrangement with the Post Office Department postmasters were appointed recruiting officers in seventy-five (75) cities and towns in the Dominion; posters were exhibited throughout the Dominion and a recruiting pamphlet was widely distributed. As a result recruiting has been satisfactory, and the complement of the Niobe is practically complete, whilst there are still a few vacancies in the Rainbow. As the advantages of the service become more widely known, it is anticipated that there will be no difficulty in obtaining recruits.

That is one side to the picture. Let us look at the other, when the blight of the hon. gentlemen's advent to power had settled down on this Canadian naval service. If you take the report of the same department for the year 1912, you will find at pages 8 and 18 the same statement repeated in these words:

Owing to the uncertainty of the future naval policy and the limited accommodation available, no special efforts have been made to obtain recruits for the navy.

Under the Liberal regime recruiting had been satisfactory; under the regime of our friends opposite, owing to the uncertainty of their naval policy, no special efforts have been made to obtain recruits, and the condition is, of course, unsatisfactory. Then, Sir, consider it from the point of view of desertions. There is not a single desertion mentioned in the report of 1911, while in the report of 1912, one hundred and forty-nine desertions are said to have taken place after the people had lost confidence in the service due to hon. gentlemen opposite being returned to power. May I say, with all respect to the Minister of Marine that before he undertakes to enlighten this House upon any branch of the Naval Service again he should read the records of his own department, become familiar with them, and not impose on the members of the Opposition the duty of refuting him from documents contained in the archives of his own office.

Up to the time the hon. member for Calgary rose to address this House yesterday afternoon, silence had long reigned supreme on the Government side, and I am bound to say that so far as the naval question is concerned that silence continued during the greater part of the hon. gentleman's three hour speech. Perhaps the mental attitude of the House with regard to the hon. gentleman's speech could be best illustrated by a story. An Irishman on a dark and stormy night lost his way on a dangerous mountain side. The rain was falling in torrents, the thunder pealed and the lightning flashed; below him ran a torrent swollen to its fullest dimensions by the downpour, and one mis-step meant the man's doom. He picked his way slowly, painfully and in fear from rock to rock with the greatest care and the greatest difficulty. Finally, unable to make any headway against the storm, he stopped, and joining his hands in prayer, raised his eyes and exclaimed: 'O Lord, more light and less noise.' The first time the hon. member for Calgary spoke in this House, my right hon. friend and leader referred to his torrential eloquence. That was in full play yesterday afternoon and last night. He went from one imaginative flight to another, in a continuous crescendo scale, until he finally imagined himself to be His Majesty the King, and, in consonance with that character, he styled our friends from the province of Quebec 'My French Canadian subjects.' When he reached that pinnacle, Mr. Speaker, I could not help thinking of the historic tilt between Gladstone and Disraeli, in the course of which one of the gladiators referred to the other as 'a man inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity.' My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) attended to the member for Calgary. The darts of the hon. member for Red Deer pierced the political armour of the member for Calgary at every point, and I can do no more than drive those darts a little further home.

Near the close of his speech, the hon. member for Calgary said that the difference between the two parties on this naval question is fundamental. I quite agree with him, and that is about the only thing he said with which I do

agree. The difference is fundamental; on one side there is involved the principle of local autonomy, on the other, centralization, and by that difference we on this side of the House are prepared to stand or fall.

Again, in referring to the resolution of March 29, 1909, the hon. gentleman declared that he and his friends had said that they would not support that resolution because it meant an independent navy. This was a surprise to a great many hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and if my hon. friend were here now, I would ask him when they made that declaration. No one made it in the House on March 29, 1909; everybody was then in favour of the resolution. It was not made in April, 1909, by the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he delivered his speech in Toronto and stood by the resolution. It was not made on July 1, 1909, when the then leader of the Opposition, the present Prime Minister, made a speech in London, and still stood by that resolution. It was not made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce at Halifax in August 1909, when he made a speech in that city, during the course of which he declared his adherence to the resolution. Neither was it made by the then leader of the Opposition when he returned from London and spoke at Halifax in October, 1909, and still declared his warm adherence to the resolution. When, then, did this party use the language attributed to it by the hon. member for Calgary? He has not given us the date; he is not here now to enlighten us, but may I suggest, as I stated in this House last session, that the first occasion upon which that view was taken was when the present master of the Administration, the Minister of Public Works, suggested to his present colleagues the political advantage that might be gained by breaking faith with Parliament and the country and departing from the terms of the resolution of March 29, 1909.

The hon. member for Calgary also said that this is not a permanent policy of contribution. If as hon. gentlemen opposite say, we can neither build ships in Canada nor find recruits for them, what else, I ask them, can there be but a policy of contributions? On December 5th last, the Prime Minister said that nothing of an efficient character could be built up in a quarter or perhaps half a century. Yesterday afternoon, when that language was referred to by the hon. member for Edmonton, the right hon. Prime Minister intervened with the statement that he had not referred specifically to ships, and that he was speaking of a naval organization. But are not ships the principal part of a naval organization? Can you have a naval organization without ships? Everybody understood the right hon. gentleman to mean ships when he used that language; his own supporters so understood him; and they have so quoted him time after time in the course of this debate.

Mr. MACDONALD: And in the country too.

Mr. MURPHY: And in the country also, as the hon. member for Pictou says. The hon. member for Calgary so understood him, be-

cause in the course of his speech yesterday he laid it down that we could not build a dreadnought in Canada in twenty years. If that is the fact, I ask hon. gentlemen on which horn of the dilemma do they wish to be impaled? We either have to wait for that length of time, as they say, and do nothing in the meantime—and be open to the awful charge of disloyalty—or, if we do anything, then that anything must mean contributions; there is no escape from that position. But the hon. member for Calgary gave the whole case away when he said: 'It is true that Australia is building a navy, but that is because they first trained their people along Imperial lines by contributions.' So, Mr. Speaker, we in Canada are to be trained along Imperial lines by this new policy of contributions! There you have the whole case in a nutshell. The hon. member for Calgary said that Australia was building ships, but I say that Australia is doing more; she is adhering loyalty to the compact entered into with the British Government and the other overseas dominions; she is adhering to the arrangement made at the last conference, at which my right hon. leader was present. A despatch published in this Morning's Montreal Gazette not only gives evidence of that, but contains the strongest possible condemnation of this Government, and puts to a severer test than we have put it the good faith of the right hon. Prime Minister in submitting these proposals in the way they have been submitted. Let me read that despatch:

Australia and Naval Defence—Commonwealth Authorities Issue Statement concerning fleet Unit Scheme With Canada and New Zealand—Declares Australian Agreement is the only one to be Carried Out—Interests in Pacific.

(Canadian Associated Press.)

London, February 26.—The commonwealth authorities in London issued this morning the text of an important statement made recently by Senator Pearce, the Australian Minister of Defence, on the question of Imperial naval defence.

Hon. Mr. Pearce explains that the Australian Government attaches no importance to its being represented on the Imperial Defence Committee, because it is of a purely advisory character. Australia was concerned in questions of policy rather than administration.

He then refers to the decisions arrived at at the last Imperial conference, when Canada and Australia adopted a fleet unit scheme, and says the Australian agreement is the only one that has been carried out. Therefore it becomes necessary for Canada and New Zealand to either carry out the schemes adopted by the 1909 conference or propose some others to take their places.

He could not say whether there was any truth in the reports that the Admiralty authorities had been parties to the suppression of the Canadian naval scheme and the substitution of contributed dreadnoughts and an annual subsidy, on the New Zealand plan.

An annual subsidy! How is it they know so much about this across the ocean, and we are permitted to know so little about it here?

—in preference to that of the creation of separate colonial naval units. We have not been given any hint either by the British Government or the Admiralty that they have changed their minds.

Mr. Speaker, let me read that again:

We have not been given any hint either by the British Government or the Admiralty they have changed their minds. In regard to the wisdom of the agreement with Australia, that agreement, I may say, originated with the Admiralty scheme for a fleet unit and did not originate with the Australian Government of the day or with the representatives at the conference.

The defence minister concludes by saying his Government was of the opinion it would be advantageous to the Empire as a whole if Australia, Canada and New Zealand could see their way to come to an agreement as to the defence of British interests in the Pacific. 'Our policy is known and has the approval of the Admiralty. It can be adjusted to meet any development in Canadian and New Zealand naval policies. We are hopeful the three countries may yet fall into line for the purpose of promoting this unity of action.'

Comment on that dispatch, Mr. Speaker, would be superfluous.

Now, to return again for a few minutes to my hon. friend the member for Calgary. In one of his most dramatic outbursts he asked the question 'where will the battle with Great Britain be fought'? I do not know; nobody on this side of the House knows. I thought when he asked that question he was going to answer it, but he did not. I submit that if that information is within his knowledge he should tell the Admiralty; it is something they would like to know. He proceeded to assert that the supremacy of Great Britain was threatened. Well, as against the ipse dixit of my hon. friend friend from Calgary, we have the assurance of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Asquith, of the First Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. Churchill, and of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Sir Edward Grey, that the supremacy of Great Britain is not threatened; and much as I hold my hon. friend from Calgary in esteem, I am bound to take the opinions of Mr. Asquith, Mr. Churchill, and Sir Edward Grey, on the question of British supremacy as against any opinion held by my hon. friend from Calgary.

The hon. gentleman professed great regard for Germany; but, while professing that regard, he insisted that that was the nation that was likely to challenge England's supremacy. He used the familiar word "menace"; he could not be aware that the language used by himself and his friends on other occasions both in this House and out of it, had produced a German peril, not in Germany, or as between Germany and England, but in the ranks of the Tory party in Canada. And with the view of allaying that menace, the Government found it convenient to appoint to the Privy Council at the beginning of this year an hon. gentleman for whom we all have the highest respect, the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Clare). The papers also announced that in order to further allay this peril, the gentleman to be appointed to succeed Senator Sullivan of Kingston in the Senate, was another estimable gentleman of German birth, whom Providence unfortunately has removed from the scene of action since that announcement was made. My hon. friend from Calgary cannot have been aware of that when he made that statement yesterday, but he used the arguments with which we are all familiar. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I cannot take his opinion on the

question of British supremacy, against that of Mr. Asquith, of Mr. Churchill or of Sir Edward Grey, neither can I take his opinion on the question of there being a German peril. I prefer rather to take my views from such a communication as I hold in my hand, a letter addressed to the editor of *The Times* by three gentlemen whose names I will read to the House presently, and who are the representatives of the Foreign Policy Committee in England. This letter is as follows:

To the Editor of *The Times*.

Sir,—The Foreign Policy Committee has, since its inception more than a year ago, persistently advocated the desirability of an improvement in the relations between this country and Germany. We have been glad to note during the last six months that the previous tension was relaxed, and that the United Kingdom and Germany were working together in friendly concord in the interests of peace through all the complex negotiations connected with the Balkan war.

We now seize the earliest opportunity of expressing our deep satisfaction at the further favourable turn events have taken in consequence of the recent statements of Admiral von Tirpitz and Herr von Jagow. We would not rashly over-estimate the significance of a declaration of which we have only the bare outline; still less would we hastily assume that all cause of trouble has disappeared or that a final limit has been placed on naval expenditure. We desire, however, to express our cordial appreciation of this definite step made by the German Government towards the establishment of a complete understanding; and although candid critics of Sir Edward Grey's policy on many occasions we feel bound to accord our fullest acknowledgments of the part which he has played in making such a step possible.

The acceptance for the first time of a standard of proportionate strength for the two navies, coupled with an announcement that German relations with Great Britain are particularly good, cannot fail to have a marked effect in cementing a lasting friendship between the two peoples. We feel confident that the spirit in which this advance is made will be fully reciprocated by our own Government and that any suggestion of a departure from the standard of naval strength laid down last year would be peremptorily rejected by them. It is manifest that a sanction of further increases would entirely destroy the possibility of any agreement being reached.

If a satisfactory settlement of this highly controversial subject can be arrived at by the two Governments they will be truly representing the sentiments of the people in both countries, and an arrest of the insane competition in armaments throughout Europe may be looked for with fresh hope. But the time has not yet come to speculate too far on future developments and we content ourselves for the present in welcoming without reserve or misgiving the course events have recently taken.

Yours, &c.

(on behalf of the Foreign Policy Committee),

Courtney of Penwith,

L. T. Hobhouse

Arthur Ponsonby

President.

Chairman.

Hon. Secretary.

The names attached to that letter must all, I submit, carry great weight in this country. The first name is that of a gentleman who occupied a very important place in the British House of Commons for a great many years. The second name is that of a gentleman, who has also been prominent in the public life of Great Britain, and

the third name, if I mistake not, is that of a gentleman who, in her lifetime acted as private secretary, or in some such confidential capacity, to Her late Majesty, Queen Victoria. We cannot, I say, be otherwise than greatly impressed by a declaration bearing such names as these.

In answer to an interrogation from my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) regarding the position of Sir Charles Tupper with reference to Imperial federation, the hon. member for Calgary admitted that Sir Charles Tupper was against the idea of a contribution, but he endeavoured, as I understood him, to justify that on the ground that Sir Charles Tupper took that position because he was looking to the ultimate federation of the Empire. My hon. friend from Calgary was singularly misinformed on that point. In the *Kingdom Papers*, No. 11, at page 40, it is pointed out:

In 1891, Lord Salisbury requested a deputation from the Imperial Federation League to prepare and submit some scheme. The league appointed a committee; the committee failed; and the league dissolved (1893.)

Sir Charles Tupper was a member of the committee. In its consultations, he had to fight those who proposed colonial contributions; and, afterwards, he wrote as follows:—

Knowing as I do that the most active members of the committee were mainly intent on levying a large contribution on the revenues of the colonies for the support of the army and navy of Great Britain, I am delighted to have been able, almost single-handed, to obtain such a report from such a committee.

In another publication, which I have under my hand, there is a communication from Sir Charles Tupper in which he points out that it was he who broke up this committee because of their taking that attitude. He was opposed to the action of the committee on the very ground upon which we, on this side of the House, oppose the present proposal before Parliament. May I point out also that upon this subject Sir Charles Tupper never changed his opinion. From the first he was opposed to a contribution not only in the days of the Imperial Federation Committee, but he has been opposed to a contribution ever since. On November 20, 1909, after the scare of that year had passed away, he wrote a letter to the present right hon. Prime Minister from which I desire to read a few paragraphs. The letter is as follows:

The Mount, Bexley Heath.

November 20, 1909.

My Dear Mr. Borden:

I have read with much interest the communication of the Canadian correspondent of the *Times* on naval defence in to-day's issue of that paper. I regard that question as more important than any mere party issue, and am glad to learn that you are resolved to maintain the patriotic attitude of the Conservative party assumed last session. A few years ago, when Canada was struggling to open up for British settlement the great granary of the world, a few gentlemen here raised the question of a Canadian contribution to the Imperial navy. I joined issue with them and was sustained by the press and public opinion. It was admitted that Canada was not only no burden to the Mother Country, but without her harbours and coal mines on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, Britain would require a larger navy. Contrast the progress of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand under Imperial management, and since it was relinquished, and it will be seen to whom their present importance is due.

The letter proceeds:

Regarding as I do British institutions as giving greater security to life, property and liberty than any other form of government, I have devoted more than half a century to increasing efforts to preserve the connection of Canada and the Crown. When Great Britain was involved in the struggle in the Transvaal, I led the van in forcing the Canadian Government to send aid. But I did not believe then, and I do not believe now, in taxation without representation. The demand which will soon be made by some that Canada should contribute to the Imperial navy in proportion to population, I regard as preposterous and dangerous.

I read with pleasure the resolution passed unanimously by the House of Commons which pledged Parliament to proceed vigorously with the construction of the Canadian navy and to support Britain in every emergency, and all that in my opinion is required is to hold the Government of the day bound to carry that out honestly. Navies are maintained largely to promote the security of the mercantile shipping of the country to which they belong.

The letter concludes with these paragraphs:

I cannot understand the demand for dreadnoughts in the face of the fact that the Admiralty and British Government have determined that it was not the best mode of maintaining the security of the Empire, and arranged with Canada and Australia (the latter of whom had offered one or two dreadnoughts) for the construction of the local navies to keep open the trade routes in case of war.

All difficulty as to the question of autonomy is now removed as it is fully recognized that the great outlying portions of the Empire are sister nations, and that means are adopted to secure uniformity in the naval forces of the Empire in the design and construction of the ships, and in the training of the officers and men. They are also to be interchangeable and thus secure uniformity in every respect so as to act as effective units of the British navy.

Of course the Government of the day will be held accountable for carrying out the policy thus agreed upon in a thoroughly effective manner, but I cannot avoid thinking that a fearful responsibility will rest upon those who disturb or destroy the compact entered into on this vitally important question.

(Sgd.) Charles Tupper.

My hon. friend from Calgary seemed to be singularly misinformed as to the attitude taken by Sir Charles Tupper in reference to the Imperial Federation League and the naval question. That hon. gentleman, in the course of his further remarks, made an attack upon my hon. friend the junior member of Halifax (Mr. Maclean) for the criticism that that hon. member had offered regarding the utterances in this country of the Hon. Walter Long and Mr. F. E. Smith. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the junior member for Halifax, in saying what he did about these two visiting Unionist members, performed a public service, and one for which I desire to express my gratitude to him. I endorse every word that my hon. friend said. What right has the Hon. Walter Long, Mr. Smith, Mr. Lawley, Mr. Grenfell, Mr. Palmer, or any other of these touring Unionists to come to this country and brand as disloyal the 625,000 Canadians who voted for the Liberal party in the last election? I resent that slander as a Canadian and a member of this House, and I refer the gentlemen who made those speeches, and their apologists in this country, to the letter of Lord Grey, written to the newspapers in London a few weeks ago, in which he adminis-

tered a stinging rebuke to them and to men of their class. I refer them also to the interview given in the city of Winnipeg by Mr. Henry Vivian, ex-member of the British House of Commons for Birkenhead, in which he said that he was scandalized and ashamed that men from his country should so abuse the hospitality of Canada as to utter the sentiments to which these gentlemen gave expression in the course of their tour through the Dominion. Then, the hon. member for Calgary quoted, in support of something that he had said, a gentleman named Mr. Archibald Hurd. If I am correctly informed Mr. Archibald Hurd is the gentleman who writes as Windermere to the Montreal Gazette.

An hon. MEMBER: The Montreal Star.

Mr. MURPHY: The Montreal Star—I beg the pardon of the Montreal Gazette. He is the gentleman who has for years supplied the hysteria to the Montreal Star in regard to this and other questions of a supposed Imperial character. Mr. Windermere, alias Mr. Hurd, has done more in one despatch to throw ridicule and obloquy upon this Government and its naval policy than all that the Liberals could do, or could hope to do, in the course of a very long lifetime. That may seem a strong statement, but you will appreciate how moderate it is when I read to you what this gentleman said in a despatch to the Montreal Star, dated December 31, 1912:

Borden's Policy Recognized by British Government with a Peerage for Sir Thomas Shaughnessy.

(Cable to the Montreal Star from its staff correspondent in London.)

London, December 31.—The first direct acknowledgment of the Borden naval policy goes to the Dominion in the grant of another Canadian seat in the House of Lords.

It is in order for Canadians to congratulate Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, president of the Canadian Pacific railway, on having been placed on the list for a peerage. On high authority I can inform the Star readers that Sir Thomas' name will appear either in the New Year's list of honours or one to follow shortly, but most probably to-morrow.

The British Government recognizes the fact that the Borden naval policy entitled Canada to another seat in the House of Lords, and Sir Thomas got the preferment. Canada may accept a new seat as a direct acknowledgment of the Borden plans. Strong Canadian influence in high quarters was exerted. Sir Thomas is recognized as a wide-awake resourceful Canadian, with a grasp of business affairs and withal a forceful speaker.

It is believed the title under which Sir Thomas will be known has been submitted. It is known here that a Governor-General for Canada, at the suggestion of the British Government would have recommended him sooner if he had not been hindered. Sir Thomas is a much richer man than is generally supposed. It is understood here the new peer will purchase an estate in Ireland or the south of England, but his acceptance of the peerage will in no way interfere with his residence in Canada. It is not stated yet whether the title is for life or hereditary.

In the meantime the Borden naval policy and its anticipated passage through the House and its acceptance by the people of Canada, is given full recognition by the bestowal of this peerage.

Windermere.

Than Sir Thomas Shaughnessy I know no more deserving citizen in this broad Dominion; than the president of the Canadian Pacific railway

there is no man with a greater grasp of the transportation problem on this continent; but I submit it is asking a little too much of the people of Canada to pay \$35,000,000 for a peerage for Sir Thomas Shaughnessy. If I know Sir Thomas at all, I think he would be the first man to object to a peerage at any such price. I have reason to believe that it is altogether beyond the price set when that great Canadian statesman Sir Max Aitken was openly charged in the newspapers of London with having bought the title bestowed on him.

Mr. CARVELL: For £5,000.

Mr. MACDONALD: Then Windermere was wrong; Sir Thomas Shaughnessy did not get a peerage.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend reminds me that Sir Thomas Shaughnessy did not get a peerage. It must have been confided to the parcel post system of the Postmaster General, or to some other uncertain means of transit; in any event it has not arrived.

An hon. MEMBER: It is waiting until the Bill gets through.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend from Calgary asserted in a general way that some hon. gentleman on this side of the House had at some time or another said that we owe nothing to England. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say here that I have never heard a Liberal make that statement. But, I have heard it said openly in this House and elsewhere that gentlemen associated with the Conservative party have made that statement publicly on a great many occasions. For instance, in the Canadian Annual Review for 1910, a publication issued by Mr. Castell Hopkins, who is a great friend and admirer of the present Prime Minister, I find that statement attributed to some gentlemen on the other side of the House. Speaking about the naval campaign that was carried on in the province of Quebec during 1910, the Canadian Annual Review for that year, at page 185, gives an account of the meeting held at Rigaud in the constituency of Vaudreuil, represented by Major Boyer, a Liberal member in this House. This is what it says:

At Rigaud on the 26th, Mr. Cousineau, M.L.A., said that all England wanted at this time was to get a Canadian contribution to her budget; Mr. Rainville denounced the French papers of Montreal as being sold to the project of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

I understand that the Mr. Rainville referred to is now a member of this House and supports the Conservative Government.

Mr. Gustave Boyer, a Liberal, followed in reply. He said: "The speakers that have preceded me said that we owe nothing to Great Britain. Is it not a fact, however, that we owe all to Great Britain? Is it not a fact that for the past fifty years we have had, under the protection of the British flag, more personal, political and municipal liberties than any other people on earth?"

There you have a striking contrast at that one meeting between the utterances of gentlemen supporting the Conservative Government and broad and patriotic utterances of the hon. member for Vaudreuil, who is a staunch Liberal.

At another page in this volume reference is made to Albert Sévigny, who is described as a Quebec advocate, and I understand that this is Mr. Albert Sévigny who now represents Dorchester in this House and who is an ally of the present Government. The Canadian Annual Review says that Mr. Sévigny appears to have been a particularly inflammable speaker, and at page 196 I read:

At Tingwick (October 31.) Alfred Sévigny, a Quebec advocate, expressed himself as follows: "The Laurier Cabinet is a Cabinet of Imperialists who want to sacrifice Canada's interests and plunge us into wars with which we have nothing to do. The navy Bill is an attempt by Ontario and the provinces of the west to coerce Quebec and enslave our people for ever. What has England ever done for you? She has no need of your help. She is strong enough to defend herself. Laurier's ideal is to make you the vassals of the majority in the west. You must protest by your vote against this slave traffic. You must protest against helping England in her wars; unless you do conscription will come next."

That will suffice to illustrate the difference between the two parties upon the question as to what we in this country owe to England.

My hon. friend from Calgary spoke about several leaders of the Liberal party who favoured independence, and to support his statement he quoted a resolution said to have been moved at the National Club in Montreal in the year 1890 by my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). Later on, my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) dealt very happily with the remarks of the hon. member with regard to that resolution. I have only to add that the hon. member for Calgary must have felt the desperate position of himself and his party when he had to go back twenty-three years in the hope of finding something that would remove from the political skirts of himself and his friends the pitch with which they have been defiled through their recent political association with the Nationalist party of the Province of Quebec. I would have thought that the hon. gentleman's knowledge of the record of his own party would have deterred him from taking that excursion into a field in which he thought he would find something committing the Liberal party to a policy of independence. However, as the hon. gentleman seems to be fond of looking up records let me refer him to a few. Let me refer him for instance to a book published by Mr. Weir, entitled "Sixty Years in Canada." If he will look at page 52 of that book, he will find the beginning of a manifesto addressed to the people of Canada and favouring the annexation of Canada to the United States; if he will look further he will find at page 63 the signatories to that manifesto and I call his special attention to the first name on that list. That name is not the name of a French-Canadian; it is not a name that by any fancy can be associated with Laurier or Lemieux; it is the name of J. J. C. Abbott, a gentleman who at one time was an honoured member of this House, and later became leader of the Conservative party and Prime Minister of Canada. I would refer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) to that manifesto and ask him how he can reconcile his present protestations of loyalty with his conduct in having followed a leader who at one time headed the annex-

ationist party in this country? Further, I would ask the hon. gentleman how he can purge himself from the taint of disloyalty that must according to his standard attach to membership in a party whose political ancestors burned the Parliament buildings and stoned the Governor-General through the streets of Montreal? I would ask him further how he can purge himself from the taint of disloyalty that, according to his standards, attaches to membership in a party whose chief mouthpiece declared that if British connection, were injured by the national policy, then so much the worse for British connection. I would ask him further how he can purge himself from the taint of disloyalty that attaches, according to his standards, to membership in a party whose leader, the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, when the British authorities appealed to him for troops for the Sudan took the position that they could come and raise troops in this country if they wished, but so far as he and his Government were concerned, not a man, not a dollar? I would ask him how he can justify the position which he took with reference to some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, when he and the members of his party opposed, not once but several times, the British preference introduced by the Liberal party of Canada? When my hon. friend answers these questions and answers them to the satisfaction of the people of this country, then he may be in a position to read us on this side of the House a lecture on loyalty.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Minister of Inland Revenue said that if Sir John A. Macdonald had been alive, troops would never have gone to South Africa.

Mr. MURPHY: Not only my hon. friend but practically all the speakers on the other side of the House have taken the position that we cannot build ships in Canada, and that the three empty ships which the Government proposes to present to Great Britain can be built more quickly and more cheaply in England. As to the first part of that statement, it has been refuted so often that I do not intend to add anything further to what has been said. I merely wish to say that it constitutes a gross slander on Canadian intelligence, Canadian industry and Canadian skill; and that the men who made that assertion will find that it will recoil upon their own heads. As to the other contention that ships can be built more quickly and more cheaply in Great Britain than in Canada, I am not, in the face of information that has come to hand, prepared to admit that, either as a general principle or as applied to the circumstances of this particular case. Let me show you why I cannot accept that statement. In Truth, the London newspaper, there appeared this statement on December 4, 1912:

It looks as if a little crop of presentation ships will have to be built. But where? The shipyards of the country are taxed to their full capacity.

Later on, there appeared in the Daily Telegraph on January 6, 1913, an article dealing with the question of ship-building, from which I will read a few extracts. The Daily Telegraph said:

Under normal conditions shipbuilding is more rapid in this country than abroad. But, owing to the pressure

of work of all kinds which now exists, considerable delays are being experienced in all the great private shipbuilding yards of the United Kingdom. This retardation will continue even if no labour troubles supervene—as is not improbable—further to retard construction. Consequently no reliance can be placed on the reputed celerity of British construction.

The same issue, discussing the navy estimates, said:

The navy estimates will reach an aggregate of nearly £50,000,000. This increase of between £4,000,000 and £5,000,000 is due to many causes.

A sum of about £2,000,000 which was not spent last year—1911-12—has to be revoted; the votes for officers and men, in consequence of the increase in numbers and the new scale of pay, will absorb an additional sum of between half and three-quarters of a million sterling.

But the serious item is traceable to the upward movement in the cost of shipbuilding. All the contracts that have been lately placed, and that will have to be placed in the near future, reflect this movement.

The article proceeds:

It is calculated that the cost of constructing an ordinary merchant vessel has advanced by over 30 per cent. in the past two years, and in the case of men-of-war the difference is proving not less remarkable.

Everything required by the Admiralty—guns, torpedoes, armour, ships' plates—all show advances. The period of cheap shipbuilding, from which the country has gained an immense advantage, has come to an end.

With all the allied industries concerned in shipbuilding working at the highest pressure—for we still build for a large part of the world—the Admiralty will have some difficulty in getting its contracts placed under a reasonable time-limit, and in every case the prices quoted show a great expansion, which is reacting seriously on the navy votes.

In view of these statements from authoritative British sources, I submit that the Government is deprived of their chief argument for having these ships built in England. If the Government were inclined to listen to the voice of reason they would pay heed to what their supporter, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) said in this House on the subject on March 29, 1909. Speaking on that occasion, the hon. gentleman declared:

Shipbuilding is a splendid enterprise, an enterprise that gives employment to a great number of men; and it is the greatest national enterprise that a country can have, greater than the manufacture of guns and weapons of defence. We should undertake the work of building carriers, because the money that is paid to foreign carriers to convey our products from Canada to Great Britain and other countries is a large sum which we should retain in our country. As I pointed out, we should immediately assume the position of establishing a local defence of our own. Our local defence should consist of torpedo boats and destroyers, and they could convoy our merchant ships, in case of war, to England and save them from the attacks of cruisers.

And he added:

I think we are all presumed to be at one upon that question.

So we were at one upon that question; and my hon. friend from North Simcoe can perform no greater public service than to bring his political friends around to the view which they held in March, 1909, on that subject.

Mr. Speaker, you have had placed in your hands by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) an amendment to the motion for the

second reading of this Bill. That amendment in effect provides that, before this Bill is read a second time, redistribution based on the returns of the last census should take place and that the people of this country should be consulted. In the speeches which my hon. friend from Assiniboia and my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) made in support of that amendment, they presented an unanswerable case, a case so unanswerable that I do not believe any attempt has been made on the opposite side of the House to reply to the arguments advanced by these hon. gentlemen. They submitted to the House in support of the amendment figures which showed that at the present time the East is over represented and the West under represented. Put in another way, the figures that they submitted established that at the present time there are five eastern representatives in this House to each western representative, and further that, if redistribution took place, there would be only three eastern representatives in this House to each western representative. Some hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House have said that there is no occasion for the Government to take the course suggested by this amendment, for the reason that when the late Government brought in a naval policy, we did not go to the country on that question. My hon. friend from Welland effectively answered that by pointing out that we, as the representatives of the Canadian people, were all united upon that question at that time, and that there was no necessity for going to the country because there was no diversity of opinion.

Another thing which differentiates the position of the late Government from the position of the present Government is that we proposed to build a navy whose cost of construction was to be borne out of revenue. The present Government propose to pay this \$35,000,000 out of capital. That, in my judgment, constitutes a vitally important difference between the two policies and affords one other reason why the people should be consulted.

But there are still stronger reasons, and I find these reasons contained in promises made by the right hon. gentleman during his trip to the West in the summer of 1911. In the course of his visit to the western provinces, my right hon. friend spoke at some forty places. At many of these places he was presented with memorials by the Grain Growers and by the United Farmers' Associations. In every one of these memorials a request was made that redistribution should take place as precedent to any general election and in every case my right hon. friend agreed with the request of the memorialists. Let us see what he said at one particular place. The Winnipeg Free Press in its issue of June 21, 1911, contains a report of the visit of my right hon. friend to Brandon. It publishes at length the memorial there presented to him by the Grain Growers. In that memorial there occurs this sentence:

Having an election before a redistribution Bill is passed, based on the census that is now being taken, would be a gross injustice to the prairie provinces of western Canada.

The Prime Minister, then the leader of the Opposition, met the request fairly and squarely, and in the same paper is reported as saying:

No one would regret more than he would to see the Government go to the country before a redistribution Bill had gone through the House.

The West was entitled to more members.

Mr. Borden said he had himself suggested to the Prime Minister that he should hurry up with the taking of the census in order that the West might get its increased representation before the mandate of the country was taken on the great question of reciprocity.

Speaking at Maple Creek on June 23, 1911, the right hon. gentleman is reported as saying:

It was a bad thing to have in power a political party that broke its promises.

I would especially commend this sentence to the Minister of Public Works. Later on the same paper reports a meeting at Lacombe, on June 27, 1911, at which the United Farmers of Alberta presented a memorial, of which the paper says:

They also asked that a redistribution take place before the next general election.

The right hon. gentleman made the same reply to that delegation. Unless the Prime Minister is prepared to abandon every one of these pledges made in the West, just as he has abandoned his position on the naval question, I submit he should support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). Whatever the Prime Minister may do in that regard, or whatever position he may take with reference to the pledges he made to the people of the West upon that trip, for my part I intend to support this amendment. In the same way, as a Canadian, and for the reasons advanced by the speakers upon this side of the House, I intend to oppose the second reading of this Bill. To my mind there is no stronger reason for doing so than that the right hon. gentleman by abandoning his previous position, has divided public opinion after it was united on this great question. He has divided public opinion not only in Canada, but in Great Britain as well. Let me refer to what took place at a great labour gathering recently held in London. In the special London correspondence of the Globe on February 15, 1913, there appeared this account of the labour party's conference:

The Labour party conference was an exceedingly interesting gathering, held in Lambeth Baths, in one of the largest industrial centers of London. The conference is a singularly composite body, consisting of members of the Independent Labour party, the Parliamentary Labour party, trades unions, trades councils and the Fabian Society. There is necessarily in such circumstances, great diversity of opinion but in spite of that there was an unusual unanimity about the three days' proceedings, and the desire for unity and for a better understanding with the Liberal party was specially noticeable.

Mr. G. H. Roberts, the Labour member for Norwich, presided, and, in the course of his presidential address, made the following refer-

ence to Premier Borden's offer of battleships to the Mother Country:—

'Much comment is evoked by Canada's offer to furnish this country with three battleships. Did the Dominion elect to build, man and maintain its own navy we would not interpose. But a gift which greatly adds to our annual expenditure is open to criticism. Accepting Government assurances that our defensive forces are sufficient and efficient, these three vessels must be in excess of requirements. Besides which, giving the colonies representation on the Imperial Defence Committee is a departure fraught with such far-reaching consequences that it must be subjected to searching inquiry. In resisting unnecessary and provocative armaments, which squander wealth otherwise badly needed, we have the glorious consciousness that the future peace, happiness and well-being of the world's millions largely depend on our exertions.'

This represents fairly the Labour point of view and the view of most Liberals on the question.

So it is perfectly obvious that my right hon. friend, by pursuing the course that he has adopted, has divided public opinion not only in this country, but in Great Britain as well, and in doing so he has dealt a fatal blow to the cause of Imperial unity which he and his friends profess to have so much at heart.

I have said that as a Canadian I will oppose this Bill. Let me add that I will oppose it also as a Liberal. In taking that position I have the authority and endorsement of the Right Hon.

Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, who, in addressing his constituents some years ago, said:

In my judgment a Liberal is a man who ought to stand as a restraining force against an extravagant policy. He is a man who ought to keep cool in the presence of jingo clamour. He is a man who believes that confidence between nations begets confidence, and that the spirit of peace and good will makes the safety it seeks. And above all, I think, a Liberal is a man who should keep a sour look for scaremongers of every kind and every size, however distinguished, however ridiculous—and sometimes the most distinguished are the most ridiculous—a cold, chilling, sour look for all of them, whether that panic comes from the sea, or from the air, or from the earth, or from the waters under the earth.

In that declaration by the present First Lord of the Admiralty there is a noble sentiment, nobly expressed:

The spirit of peace and goodwill makes the safety it seeks

Mr. Speaker, that is the spirit in which a Canadian naval policy was conceived by a Liberal Government; and it is because we believe that Canada is still animated by that spirit that we are unalterably opposed to the present Bill, and demand that it be submitted to the people in order that they may pass judgment upon it.